

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action dated March 7, 2008. Reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-23 are pending in the Application. By means of the present amendment, claims 1-23 are amended including for better conformance to U.S. practice, such as deleting reference numerals typically used in European practice that are known to not limit the scope of the claims. Further amendments include changing depending claims to begin with "The". By these amendments, claims 1-23 are not amended to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

In the Office Action, restriction is required as between claims 15-17 and 20-22, designated as Species I; claim 4, designated as Species II; claims 9 and 10, designated as Species III; and claims 11-13, designated as Species IV, claims 9 and 10, designated as Species III; claims 11-13, designated as Species IV, claim 14, designated as Species V, and claims 18 and 19, designated as Species VI. Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are indicated as generic to all species. Claim 8 is indicated as generic to Species III and IV.

This restriction requirement is respectfully traversed regarding a separation of Species VI as a separate species.

Election of Species Under Traverse

In response, as a formality merely to comply with §818.03(b), Applicants hereby preliminarily elect claims 15-17 and 20-22, designated as Species I, for an examination on the merits together with generic claims 1-3 and 5-7.

Arguments in Support of Traversal of Designation of Claims 18

and 19 as a Separate Species

The Office Action states that claims 18 and 19 are a separate species, namely Species VI. This separation of species is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that claims 18 and 19 are generic to all species. Claim 18 recites in pertinent part (emphasis added) "the impeller or at least one of the impellers is located in the hair chamber for displacing liquid inside the hair chamber." While claims 18 and 19 as well as all other claims previously recited reference designations indicating portions of figures that may pertain to the claim elements, as is clear, the reference designations are not interpreted as claim

limitations in that the reference designations are merely added to comply with filing requirements under the Paris Convention Treaty. The specification makes clear that (emphasis added) "[a] hair chamber in which cut-off whiskers, hair dust, and skin chips accumulate, is located behind a shaving head or shaving heads of a shaver with a shaving screen ..." (See, specification, page 1, lines 3-5.) It is respectfully submitted that positioning of the one or more impellers in the hair chamber in terms of the present application is shown in all of the figures and is at least shown in FIGs. 1, 2, 3, 9 and 10, which encompasses at least Species I and III. Similarly, claim 19 recites in pertinent part (emphasis added) "at least two of the impellers located in the hair chambers, the at least two impellers being connected to a drive structure for driving the at least two impellers in a common sense of rotation" which again, even presuming the further limitations imposed by dependence on claim 18, is generic to all the species and at least to Species I and III.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the restriction of claims 18 and 19 into a separate species, and at least separate from Species I and III be reconsidered and reversed, and that claims 18 and 19 be examined on the merits.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

A favorable action on the merits including examination and allowance of the claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By Gregory L. Thorne

Gregory L. Thorne, Reg. 39,398  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
April 2, 2008

**THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP**  
Applied Technology Center  
111 West Main Street  
Bay Shore, NY 11706  
Tel: (631) 665-5139  
Fax: (631) 665-5101